

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/537,723	03/30/2000	Takashi Iwasa	ni Iwasa P107348-09095		
75	90 03/25/2004	EXAMINER			
Robert K Carpenter Arent Fox KIntner Plotkin & Kahn PLLC			HARPER, HOLLY R		
1050 Connecticut Avenue N W Suite 600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, D	C 20036-5339	2879			

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<del></del>			en		
		Ap	plication No.		Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09	9/537,723		IWASA ET AL.			
		Ex	aminer		Art Unit			
			Ily R. Harper		2879			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	ation appears	s on the cover she	eet with the co	orrespondence ad	iaress		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC nsions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicated period for reply specified above, the maximum state priod for reply is specified above, the maximum state ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply wreply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION.  f 37 CFR 1.136(a).  nication.  days, a reply withi  utory period will app  ill, by statute, caus	In no event, however, r in the statutory minimum ply and will expire SIX (6 e the application to beco	may a reply be time of thirty (30) days MONTHS from to ome ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timel he mailing date of this c (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.		
1)🔀	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 12/9/03						
			on is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restricti	e withdrawn fr						
Applicat	ion Papers							
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the The drawing(s) filed on 20 March 2006 Applicant may not request that any object Replacement drawing sheet(s) including to The oath or declaration is objected to	② is/are: a)⊠ ion to the draw he correction is	ring(s) be held in a s required if the dra	beyance. See awing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).		
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
* \$ 13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for the priority of the prio	ocuments ha ocuments ha f the priority of al Bureau (Po for a list of the domestic pri in the first se guage provision domestic pri	ve been received ve been received documents have CT Rule 17.2(a)) ne certified copies ority under 35 Unitence of the special application had ority under 35 Uniterity under 35 Uniterity under 35 Uniterity under 35 Uniterity under 35 University und	d. d in Application been receive s not receive S.C. § 119(e ecification or has been receives	on No  d in this National  d. ) (to a provisional in an Application eived. and/or 121 since	I application) Data Sheet. a specific		
Attachmen	it(s)							
2) D Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paj			ce of Informal Pa	PTO-413) Paper No( atent Application (PT			

Art Unit: 2879

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim (USPN 5,908,699).

In regard to claim 1, the Kim reference discloses an electronic element with a cesium-carbon-oxide layer (Abstract). The layer forms tips in an FED (Figure 3, Element 36). The layer is formed by deposition (Column 3, Lines 63-66).

3. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sullivan et al. (USPN 5,821,680).

In regard to claim 16, the Sullivan reference discloses an electronic element that has at least two layers of amorphous carbon film (Abstract). This includes a main body and a surface layer. The surface layer has an amorphous-tetrahedrally coordinated carbon material (Column 8, Lines 1-4).

In regard to claim 17, the Sullivan reference discloses that the electronic element is used as a field emitter for cold cathode field emission applications (abstract). Field emitters emit

Art Unit: 2879

electrons with the application of an electric field to the cold cathode element (Column 4, Lines 2-4).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (USPN 5,908,699).

In regard to claim 2, the Kim reference discloses that the film has an amorphous film of carbon (Abstract) and that the projections are conical (Figure 3, Element 36). The Kim reference does not disclose the height of the tips. It has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. Increasing the height increases the relative field strength at the tips and would be manipulated to meet the desired limitations.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to specify the height of the emitter tips to be between 10 and 500 nanometers, since discovering an optimum value of a result variable is considered within the skills of the art.

In regard to claim 3, the Examiner notes that the claim limitation of the amorphous film of carbon formed by an ion beam deposition process using a negative ion beam is drawn to a process of manufacturing, which is incidental to the claimed apparatus. It is well established that a claimed apparatus cannot be distinguished over prior art by a process limitations.

Art Unit: 2879

Consequently, absent a showing of an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art, the subject product-by-process claim limitation is not afforded patentable weight (see MPEP 2113).

In regard to claims 4 and 5, the Kim reference discloses that the amorphous film of carbon is a cold cathode element (Abstract), which emits electrons when an electric field is applied (Column 1, Lines 30-40).

6. Claims 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pehrsson et al. (USPN 6,554,673).

In regard to claim 6, the Pehrsson reference discloses an electronic element with a main body formed of amorphous film of carbon (Claim 1) that contains cesium (Column 3, Lines 47-52). Cesium is a metal element having a metal bond radius equal to or larger than two times the atom radius of carbon. A layer of amorphous film of carbon is used as a surface layer over the main layer (Column 3, Line 65 – Column 4, Line 3). The Pehrsson reference does not specifically state that the amorphous carbon is tethrahedrally bonded. Amorphous carbon can be either sp<sup>2</sup> or sp<sup>3</sup>, but tetrahedrally bonded carbon is harder, more transparent, and more electrically insulating than sp<sup>2</sup>. Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to have an amorphous carbon that is tetrahedrally bonded because of its beneficial properties for displays.

In regard to claim 7, the Pehrsson reference discloses an amorphous carbon film layer. It is a property of the surface layer that the half-value width Hw of a photoelectron spectrum of  $C_{1S}$  is equal to or smaller than 2.0 eV.

Art Unit: 2879

In regard to claims 8 and 9, the Pehrsson reference discloses that that the main body has a plurality of projections (Figure 1f, Elements 11a) containing cesium (Column 3, Lines 49-51). The surface layer of amorphous carbon is formed under the thin protective layer (Figure 1f, Element 18) (Column 3, Line 65 – Column 4, Line 3). Therefore, the surface layer would be formed over the projections (Element 11a) and part of the film projecting downward.

In regard to claims 10 and 11, the Pehrsson reference discloses that the amorphous carbon layer contains cesium (Column 3, Lines 47-52).

In regard to claims 12 and 13, the Examiner notes that the claim limitation of "said main body and said surface layer formed by an ion beam deposition process "is drawn to a process of manufacturing, which is incidental to the claimed apparatus. It is well established that a claimed apparatus cannot be distinguished over the prior art by a process limitation. Consequently, absent a showing of an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art, the subject product-by-process claim limitation is not afforded patentable weight (see MPEP 2113).

In regard to claims 14 and 15, the Pehrsson reference discloses that the electronic element emits electrons with the application of an electric field to the cathode (Abstract).

7. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pehrsson (USPN 6,554,673) in view of Cuomo et al. (USPN 5,852,303).

In regard to claims 18 and 19, the Pehrsson reference discloses an electronic element that has a main layer of amorphous carbon with cesium and a surface layer of amorphous carbon.

The Pehrsson reference does not specify the amount of cesium in the amorphous carbon film, but the Cuomo reference teaches that the percentage of cesium should be between .01 and 25 percent of the carbon content (Column 10, Lines 18-22). If the amount of cesium is above 25%, the

concentration is so high that the cesium atoms will bond with each other, creating a less stable matrix (Column 4, Lines 15-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a concentration of cesium in a range of .01 to 25 percent, as taught by Cuomo, to prevent the cesium atoms from bonding with each other and making the matrix less stable.

#### Response to Arguments

- 8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 and 18-19 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 9. Applicant's arguments filed 12/9/03 with respect to claims 16 and 17 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regard to applicants claim that Sullivan is missing claimed limitations, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claim does not contain the limitation "a metal element having a metal body radius equal to or larger than two times the atom radius of carbon" (Page 7, Lines 8-10 of the response). Sullivan does meet all the claimed limitations of the claim.

#### Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Holly Harper whose telephone number is (571) 272-2453. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2879

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7382.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

980

Holly Harper Patent Examiner Art Unit 2879 Joseph Williams Joseph Williams